The Chadwicks and Lord Raglan: A Retrospective Analysis

F. A. de Caro
Department of English
Louisiana State University

ABSTRACT: The ideas of Hector Munro Chadwick and Nora Kershaw Chadwick are known to American Folklorists, but in a rather sketchy way. The writings of Lord Raglan, who in some ways represents a theoretical position in opposition to that of the Chadwicks, are much better known. This situation is ironic, for the Chadwicks were meticulous and professional scholars, whereas Raglan is easily faulted. The purpose of the present article is to provide a fairly extensive discussion of the Chadwicks' views, especially those relevant to the historicity of tradition; this may stimulate further interest in approaching their work directly. In many ways the Chadwicks present a strong contrast to Raglan.

The names Hector Munro Chadwick and Nora Kershaw Chadwick are generally well known to American folklorists. These individuals exercised a particularly strong influence upon Richard M. Dorson, and it is probably accurate to state that his writing and teaching have been more influential in propagating an American awareness of the Chadwicks' work than has any other factor. Yet, unfortunately, this awareness is little more than that: names vaguely associated with scattered ideas. American students of folklore are much more apt to have a first-hand acquaintance with the writings of Lord Raglan, who represents a theoretical position in opposition to that of the Chadwicks, and to rely upon one of Dorson's brief discussions for knowledge of the Chadwicks. That is ironic, for, as interesting as Raglan can be, so far as the question of the historical validity of folklore is concerned, any comparison between Raglan and the Chadwicks leaves the Monmouthshire peer on the short end of the proverbial stick. I have thought that it might prove useful to offer an analysis of the Chadwicks' ideas that attempts to go into greater detail than Dorson's short discussions, in hopes that this may stimulate further interest in approaching them directly. Actually such an analysis might also serve as a sort of rudimentary guide, for the weighty volumes that the Chadwicks produced are a bit formidable and the reader may find it helpful to have established in his own mind an awareness of what the Chadwicks are setting out to do before he approaches their work directly.

The Chadwicks are difficult to approach and, ironically, the very erudition of their great work, The Growth of Literature,[1] overwhelming simply in scope and sheer size, has perhaps been a factor in inhibiting American folklorists. Although they carefully examine the oral literatures of a dozen cultures, past and contemporary, their method, which asks the same questions again and again about differing bodies of material, may seem a dry and repetitious rather than an incisively painstaking approach. A second factor to prevent their being read is their decidedly literary orientation in a time when American students of folklore are becoming increasingly enamoured of social scientific approaches and ever more distant from certain aspects of the humanism of the past.

The Chadwicks as Literary Scholars

The Chadwicks were first and foremost literary scholars. Their interest lay chiefly in oral literature (in which term they saw no contradiction) and they were quick to point out that the connection between literature and writing is accidental in nature and of a relatively late date.[2] The Growth of Literature is an extensive survey of various oral literatures, the most extensive treatment that has ever been attempted in English, quite probably the most extensive that ever will be written in our age of specialization. Its title indicates clearly their basic approach, though the growth with which they were concerned is not a wholly systematic one. They saw literature (essentially oral literature) as progressing through several stages, the preheroic, the heroic (when certain martial themes dominate, though certain religious themes are also present) and various postheroic stages (when the peripheral religious themes of the heroic stage become dominant, when the heroic narratives develop into a courtly literature, or when certain other specialized forms develop). These literary stages, they thought, could perhaps be roughly correlated with historical social developments. The heroic period, or Heroic Age, as the Chadwicks termed it, had formed the subject of an earlier work by Hector Chadwick.[3] This Heroic Age cannot be called the subject of their great three-volume undertaking, for they were concerned with much more, both other "ages" and nonheroic types of oral literature.[4] Nonetheless, the Heroic Age remains at the center of their conception of oral literature, and it is a conception that is of particular relevance to the study of folklore as valid historical document. Many of the most important extant examples of earlier oral literature are heroic in orientation (such as the Homeric poems and the Ramayana), and the Chadwicks do place a particular emphasis on heroic characteristics.

We must never forget that the Chadwicks' first aim was not to prove that heroic lore has a grounding in historical fact but was to study intensively certain types of literature. Thus any attempt to approach their findings must begin with their attitudes towards the literatures, first of Greece and Western Europe, then of other parts of the world. The Chadwicks were initially interested in what they termed "independent" literatures, those which were largely uninfluenced by any other, oral or written. This position seems to have arisen at first from Hector Chadwick's work in Anglo-Saxon[5] and his realization that that language possesses a literature by and large unrelated to modern English literature and largely uninfluenced by any contemporary literature. By confining their attentions in their first volume to "independent" literatures they were able to keep down the sheer bulk of materials to be studied, for only Greek, Irish, Welsh, Anglo-Saxon and Teutonic (Icelandic) literatures qualified as "independent." More significant, however, was the establishment of the importance of native oral traditions as the basis of these literatures, in the face of scholarly opinion which had insisted upon written and foreign influences.[6] The establishment of this fact is of definite significance also in finally relating heroic literature to an historical Heroic Age; if none of the heroic literatures have borrowed from each other or any other source, it stands to reason that a Heroic Age independently developed in literature inevitably represents a stage of actual historical development in the various societies studied.[7]

The Literary Pattern

In their first volume (published in 1932) the Chadwicks delineated the nature of certain "patterns" and much of their later volumes was taken up with the working out of these patterns in other literatures. The first pattern to be considered here is a purely literary one; that is, it relates to internal, structural similarities. The Homeric and certain Anglo-Saxon poems can be seen to have certain structural elements in common; other works of heroic literature also contain these elements, though not quite so uniformly. Although there is no need here to go into these structural characteristics in detail, the student of folk literature should find in them much that is both interesting and familiar. Heroic poems have four principal elements in common. They are (1) narratives, (2) of adventure (though not only concerned with adventure), (3) apparently designed for entertainment, and (4) set in a Heroic Age (which is usually seen as belonging to the recent past).

There are certain other common features, such as (5) anonymity of authorship, (6) similar metrical form (within any given cultural group), and (7) unbroken verse (that is, in neither stanzas or strophes). Three other elements will seem particularly familiar to those aware of the research of Milman Parry and Albert B. Lord. Stylized speeches (8) are important; there are many fully developed descriptions, even of ordinary events (9); and there is (10) an abundance of formulae. Finally, (11) the length of time of the action is limited to a short period, and (12) the events are set in the past, but not far in the past (an aspect which ties in with the general conception of the Heroic Age).[8]

The Heroic Age Pattern

This first pattern, although purely literary, leads inevitably to a second, that relating to the Heroic Age itself. This second pattern is literary in that it relates to the Heroic Age as depicted in heroic literature, but it also poses the problem of that Age as historical reality, in that what was depicted is a way of life that may well have existed. Life in the Heroic Age, whether historical or not, is strikingly similar in all the heroic literature the Chadwicks studied. The pattern of the heroic milieu runs as follows. (1) The social standing of the "personnel" is high, with virtually all the characters being princes, nobles, some sort of quasi-nobility, or their servants or retainers.[9] (2) The heroic narratives are set in the field of adventure or at a court, with court formalities, dress and festivities described at length. (3) The accessories of court life, especially weapons and horses, are made much of. (4) Explicit statements on social mores, conventions and values may or may not be made, but more often not. But, whether values and standards are explicitly explained or not, similar virtues are clearly evident in all the literatures, with some variation of course. Courage, physical strength, loyalty (of a purely personal variety), and generosity -- especially to minstrels or seers -- are stressed virtues. There is often a strict sense of honor (though heroes may sometimes circumvent it), and much etiquette and courtesy.[10]

This milieu is of course dominated by martial spirit and aims, and by a type of war which consists chiefly of predatory raids. Interest centers in the individual hero, who embodies the values and beliefs noted in (3)

and (4), immediately above, and his band of followers. There is seldom any feeling for nationality, and loyalty is purely personal or directed toward the group centered around the individual, princely hero. There is no sense of community rooted in the concept of "nation" and persons of the same "nationality" engage in bitter fights against each other. Russians may fight Russians, yet mingle freely with the invading Tatars. The warfare itself is individual, single combat being the rule, with heroes famed not for generalship but personal prowess. Plunder and personal glory motivate the heroes, who are sometimes forced to fight (and who win) against tremendous odds.[11]

The Implications of the Two Patterns

Thus we see established two related patterns, each of which poses two alternatives, one in regard to structural similarities, the other in regard to similarities in content of a large body of oral literature. With the first pattern we must ask whether the structural similarities are the result of coincidence or of a universal social stage which produces a certain type of literature. With the second pattern we must ask whether the striking similarities in the depicted milieux are the result of feats of the imagination (coincidental at that) or of the describing of a real, existing way of life. The Chadwicks sought to solve this problem and at the very outset of their first volume had in fact posed three questions: What is the Heroic Age, and is it purely literary or does it demand real social and political conditions as a basis? Are historical elements essential to heroic story? Can we speak of the "beginning" of such an age (thereby defining it more neatly)?[12] The answers to these questions are of prime importance to understanding whether historical reality underlies a large amount of oral lore. The Chadwicks attempted to provide answers partly by establishing criteria for determining the historical validity of traditions and by then applying these criteria to bodies of folk literature.

Historical and Unhistorical Elements

Throughout their volumes the two authors attempt for each literature an assessment of the particular historical and unhistorical elements therein, basing their conclusions on their own extensive research and upon that of others.

A. Historical Elements

They are first concerned with the factual historicity of individual traditions, rather than the general historicity of a widespread historical phase or age. Their research, attempted on such a vast scale, led them to the inescapable conclusion that many personalities of the various Heroic Ages could without doubt be connected to historical figures. In determining this the scholars carefully sorted their evidence into eight categories and made assumptions about the value of each category. In this their method resembles standard historical procedure and in some respects the procedure worked out by Jan Vansina some years later.[13] The most valid evidence, in their view, consists of (a) contemporary native (written) records, and (b) foreign records, not necessarily contemporary. Independent traditions from a different region (c) are nearly as valid, and independent traditions from the same region (d) may

also be validly used with care. The very consistency of the same tradition (e) may also be a reasonably sure guide under certain circumstances. The use of these last three types of historical evidence by Vansina and other Africanists has, of course, been extensive, and they have proved time and again that comparison of traditions and the resulting consistency may yield even better results than the Chadwicks hoped. In addition we have archaeological evidence (f), although the Chadwicks seem not to have recognized the full potential of archaeology. Finally, they add two categories having to do with personal and place names and warn the reader against the shakiness of their validity. If they err, the Chadwicks err on the side of conservatism.[14]

It would be pointless to discuss or summarize their many individual findings regarding the historicity of persons and events in traditional narratives, but their investigations must be acknowledged as often quite ingenious. Their profound grasp of philology, for example, enabled them to spot obvious interpolations of heroic names that might be missed by historians.[15] They even note how Russian byliny preserve accurate descriptions of physical features in southern Russia, which neither the singers nor their immediate ancestors could possibly have seen.[16] They demonstrate repeatedly what they assert in the concluding remarks in the third volume, that it is regrettable that historians do not know the oral literary texts, and literary scholars do not understand the historical applications of these texts.

B. Unhistorical Elements

They were not content, however, merely to deal with historical elements. Unhistorical elements had to be dealt with, and the Chadwicks also catalogued, if in fairly rudimentary outline, the various potential configurations of unhistorical elements. These essentially fall into three categories: (1) Conflict with (a) valid historical evidence, or (b) other heroic narrative.[17] (2) Incredible incidents. These involve the introduction of supernatural beings, the attribution of supernatural power to humans (including the superhuman prowess of most heroes), and stories about the fantastic birth and childhood of the hero. (3) Matters which in context are probably unhistorical, such as motifs and characters clearly adopted from other stories.[18] The most common tendency the Chadwicks observed was the trend toward exaggeration and the attribution of superhuman powers to a hero.[19] This catalogue (one might call it a "model") may seem to make fairly obvious distinctions. Yet the need to schematize the basic possibilities for "distortion" from history also seems apparent, and it is reassuring that this task has been accomplished by scholars who had command of such a large body of folklore. If their schema seems too general, it offers all the potential for being fleshed out by others for individual bodies of folklore.

The Achievement of the Chadwicks

But the Chadwicks' greatest contribution to the study of history and folklore lies not in their vast survey of historical and unhistorical elements in various oral literatures, major as this may be. It lies rather in their formulation of a broad concept. But if we are to come finally to an understanding of this concept, a brief recapitulation is in order. The structural and content patterns indicated the possibility that similar sociopolitical conditions (a real Heroic Age) account for

literary developments. The healthy number of correspondences between characters in heroic oral narrative and real historical figures takes us a long way toward proving this possibility. If many of the characters in heroic literature are historical, is it not reasonable to assume that the milieux have historical grounding also? And if these milieux are basically similar all over the world, should we not conclude that the Heroic Age is a standard phase of historical development, producing its own unique type of folklore, rooted in historical conditions? To bolster these conclusions, the Chadwicks provided a second way of answering the three questions noted above.[20] The Heroic Ages of Greece and of Ireland are irrevocably gone, but similar conditions can be observed in and fully documented by contemporary and near-contemporary societies. The Yugoslav Heroic Age persisted down to the end of the nineteenth century and the patterns of the Heroic Age can be clearly discerned in present-day societies in Africa and elsewhere.[21] This evidence corroborates the earlier textual evidence with what could be called "external" proof. This method or corroboration may seem slightly Tylorian, but it is no doubt a valid mode of reasoning in the present context when undertaken with caution.

The Chadwicks, then, arrived at a conception of historical Heroic Ages as underlying an important body of folk literature. This stage of human development is a "barbaric" age lying in time somewhere between "primitive" culture and "civilization." It is thus a transitory time and may last for only a few generations. It is not a clear-cut phase of history, for it undergoes change throughout the course of its existence. At one stage the prince may not retain a standing "army" and may not significantly differ from his followers, at a later stage he may lead a regular "army" and be much wealthier than and out of contact with his people. Also, "nonheroic" classes may come to prominence as the Age pushes on toward civilization. Contact with other groups is limited and leads to intermittent, raiding warfare (which tends to cease with the sophisticated inter-group contact of civilization). War is a constant condition, the military classes rule, and they lavish attention upon poets to sing their glories.[22]

The Heroic Age is also a time for which there is little good historical information. It is prehistoric or exists in the "twilight" of history. Some Heroic Ages can be dated to some extent, the Teutonic through Greek and Roman sources, the Russian through certain medieval chronicles, others through internal or archaeological evidence.[23] But records are generally scanty. This is no accident, however, for the Heroic Age is a tumultuous and transitory time which does not lend itself to the record keeping that comes with civilization.[24] It is a unique period which produces a unique type of oral tradition and hence a unique type of historical record. And the very realization that certain periods produce unique historical records is one major and fruitful conclusion to be reaped from the Chadwicks' work. It is a conclusion that demands a special attitude toward tradition as a source of historical information.

This conclusion hardly relates to the only promising approach suggested by the Chadwicks' work, and the future could well hold in store further studies that tie in with their basic conceptions. There could well be other probing studies of individual Heroic Ages, especially in the light of growing archaeological knowledge. Richard Dorson has shown how aspects of the Heroic Age may be paralleled in folklores which are not the

products of a Heroic Age per se in his discussion of Davy Crockett legends. The idea that other types of clearly defined historical periods give rise to other distinct types of folklore also offers possibilities, to which the Chadwicks themselves were quite sensitive.[25] They also took historians to task and regretted that the historians' attitude toward tradition leaves something to be desired.[26] The Growth of Literature contains a key to a body of historical information which perhaps alone can tell us about certain aspects of man's development. As the Chadwicks stated:

> Note may be taken of the fact that the earliest stories indicate the prevalence of political and social conditions very different from those of historical times. If these conditions once really existed -- and it is extremely unlikely that they are purely imaginary -- the memory of them can hardly have been preserved except in connection with traditional narrative.[27]

Raglan and the Historical Validity of Tradition

Curiously, the Chadwicks shared something in common with their great "opponent," Lord Raglan. It is perhaps specious to speak of these individuals as "opponents" or to think of them in terms of a "debate," for there is little evidence that the Chadwicks and Raglan noticed each other much if at all. The Chadwicks of course had published The Growth of Literature between 1932 and 1940, just as Raglan appeared in print on the scholarly scene. For all practical purposes it is impossible to assess what they may have thought of him, if anything, from their published work. In Raglan's principal relevant work, The Hero,[28] he cites only Hector Chadwick and then merely three times, and he seems to lump Chadwick, who had carefully and brilliantly studied the historical foundation for certain traditions, into a group of various writers such as R. W. Chambers, M. E. Durham, and Sir John Rhys[29] who had only touched upon the question in passing. Yet in spite of this nonconfrontation it seems right to discuss Raglan and the Chadwicks together, for they are clearly the most powerful English advocates of opposing positions on history and folklore in the twentieth century.

What they shared is a healthy skepticism toward the ability of storytellers to create their narratives out of their own imaginations. In place of "pure" imagination each substituted the observation of something concrete and tangible. The Chadwicks stressed the observation of historical events and conditions, whereas Raglan insisted that narratives arise out of the "observation" of sacred ritual. Thus he backed himself into a position which denies the power of the imagination alone to create narrative lore, but which must also deny the influence of what would seem to be the most obvious stimulus to story-making, the events and conditions surrounding the folk poet; he then had to take the extreme position that every oral narrative descends in some way from a narrative (myth) based on ritual.

This indicates something else Raglan had in common with the Chadwicks. His interest in the historicity of tradition was secondary to another purpose, as their interest was, in a sense, secondary to literary study. Raglan's prime interest was in propounding his ritual-to-myth theory, in proving that myths are by their very nature the associative narratives of rituals, and that all oral narrative ultimately goes back to

ritual. In order to prove this extreme position he felt the need to dispose of the proposition that myth and folk narrative are rooted in actual happenings (the possibility of their being rooted in more general historical conditions apparently not having occurred to him). Thus the first thrust of Raglan's The Hero aims at demolishing the historicity of tradition as an important preliminary step in a larger design. It is a thrust which Raglan prosecuted vigorously, however. Unfortunately Raglan time and again overstated his case, frequently trampling straw men into the dust.

One would like to give Raglan a fair hearing and his fair due of credit. Certainly many of the observations he makes are valid and valuable. Yet it is difficult to take him seriously on the whole, especially in light of the findings of such scholars as Vansina and the Chadwicks. His method of approach seems naïve, and his biases, though refreshingly open, are preconceived biases nonetheless.

In The Hero Raglan begins, not unreasonably, by asserting an indispensable connection between history and accurate chronology. But to Raglan only written chronology is accurate chronology, and he sets out with a strongly rooted belief in the historical imcompetence of preliterates and indeed in the inability of the mass of humanity to take an objective view of history. Though he feels that our own cultural biases make us only too willing to accord to more "primitive" peoples something of the historical sense we matter-of-factly assume for ourselves, he seems unable to realize that his own cultural centrism has blinded him to the potential validity of historical conceptions not rigidly based upon the Western system of written, scientific history. Other systems of time reckoning are simply wrong. He seems unable to see that other systems might be studied as coherent systems, so that accurate interpolations of their time might be construed in scientific terms. Recent studies have of course shown that non-Western systems of time reckoning can be incredibly complex and logical.[30] Raglan sees them merely as ignorant, shallow, and mistaken. Likewise, nonchronological history must be rejected entirely in his view. He could not recognize the feasibility of first understanding oral historical narratives on their own terms, then interpreting them in terms of accurate chronology, a feat which is often possible. And, as we stated above, Raglan seems never to have thought of the recovery of social historical information from oral tradition; social history, after all, may require only rather generalized chronology.[31]

Raglan relies on a number of examples to underscore the inaccuracy of tradition, but these examples represent essentially an inadequate sampling and seem to be taken from those very areas where one would expect to find inaccuracies. He recounts, for example, a number of local British traditions which are patently wrong in the light of more valid historical knowledge. Although there can be no doubt that Raglan is correct in exposing the historical falsehoods of such village lore, acted upon by centuries of credulity and tenuous antiquarian speculation, he fails to realize that the English village today represents a society less suited for the accurate transmission of oral history than may exist elsewhere. He really does not understand folklore transmission in general, except in terms of peasants telling each other fanciful stories and thereby preserving "folk memory."[32] He seems to know naught of the feats of memory involved in the compositional techniques of oral heroic poems and the implications this sort of "memorization" carries for the

accurate transmission not only of "text," but of historical facts inextricably bound up with "texts." Nor does he in The Hero take account of social institutions, in African, Polynesian and other cultures, which are designed to insure the accurate retention of historical traditions.[33] Another favorite area for Raglan's examples is the "traditional pedigree," a choice which would hardly occur to an American or anyone not of the English gentry, and a choice which underscores Raglan's rather aristocratic biases (that seem to want to deny the humble their right to a real tradition). Again we must agree that his examples cannot be argued with. But the realm of genealogy, whether traditional or "official," is notoriously flexible. Naturally, we should expect to find a great deal of error, much of it the result of deliberate distortion.[34]

The American anthropologist William Bascom, who wrote in opposition to Raglan's myth-ritual theory, clearly grasped the essence of Raglan's thinking on history. Bascom noted that a big part of the theory rests on the assumption that myths must come from rituals because they cannot be based in history or in the imagination of the verbal artist.[35] (Indeed, Raglan had asked, "How could legends which account for and interpret ritual acts have an historical basis?")[36] Then Raglan argued against historicity by pulling together a mass of evidence indicating historical inaccuracies in tradition. But, Bascom pointed out, a mass of examples does not prove inaccuracy per se; nor does inaccuracy imply the complete absence of any historical basis in fact and hence prove a basis in ritual.[37] Almost as though he wanted to prove Bascom's point, Raglan countered with yet another isolated example, noting how local villagers had created a stereotype of his grandfather that simply missed the mark.[38]

If we have to opt for a "winning side" in the twentieth century "debate" in Britain over the historical value of oral tradition, we would certainly choose the reasoning of those who affirm its value. The Chadwicks marshalled an argument which is impressive in scope and above all professional and well tempered. Raglan, writing in the tradition of the gentleman scholar, undermined his own position through extremist inflexibility. Certainly, negative points can be scored against the accuracy of tradition, and a skeptical attitude is advisable, but a position which is arrived at only via the assembling of highly selective examples, pressured by the needs of a larger theory at that, can only invite disbelief.[39]

NOTES

1. 3 vols. (Cambridge, 1932-1940). Unless otherwise noted all ensuing references are to The Growth of Literature.

2. The Chadwicks strongly emphasize the fact that numerous cultures have possessed the art of writing, but have used it only for mundane matters, while preserving their literature orally, sometimes for centuries.

3. The Heroic Age (Cambridge, 1912).

4. The Growth of Literature should also be viewed as a valuable guide to a great many types of oral literary forms as found in a number of cultures (most of them "extinct"); doubtlessly some of the Chad-

wicks' information is now outdated, as Felix J. Oinas has pointed out ("Folk Epic," in Folklore and Folklife: An Introduction, ed. Richard M. Dorson [Chicago, 1972], p. 112). But there is simply no other work in English which pulls together so much material.

5. Chadwick was Elrington and Bosworth Professor of Anglo-Saxon at Cambridge.

6. I, xii.

7. I, 1-10.

8. I, 20-24. The first four elements are vitually invariable, though the other characteristics sometimes exhibit exceptions; see II, 478-481; for an outline summary of these characteristics as examined throughout the course of all three vols., see III, 750-754.

9. Farmers, artisans and merchants are almost universally ignored; no one could contend that the oral literature which the Chadwicks studied yields a "grassroots" view of history.

10. I, 64-78; II, 77-89, 490-491.

11. I, 80-95; II, 92-99, 488-495.

12. I, 18.

13. Jan Vansina, Oral Tradition: A Study in Historical Method, trans. H. M. Wright (Chicago, 1965); for a succinct statement of the methodological procedure of African ethnohistorians, see Daniel McCall, Africa in Time Perspective: A Discussion of Historical Reconstruction from Unwritten Sources (New York, 1969), p. 59.

14. I, 133-134, 140, 144-161, 179-196.

15. I, 135-137.

16. See, for example, II, 122. More recently Louis Dupree, "The Retreat of the British from Kabul to Jalalabad in 1842: History and Folklore," Journal of the Folklore Institute 4 (1967): 58-74, has shown how topographical features can be used in conjunction with traditional history.

17. For example, the narrator of the Anglo-Saxon poem Widsith says he visited the courts of three kings who died c. 370, in 437 and c. 570 (a); there are also discrepancies in Irish heroic narratives regarding certain characters (b).

18. For example, motifs and characters may be taken from other stories; the Cyclops incident in the Odyssey is taken from a folktale.

19. I, 199-240. They feel that the different types of unhistorical elements are apt to creep in at different historical stages, but they are unable to formulate any laws governing this (I, 238-239); see also III, 744-746, 758ff. The Chadwicks seem to feel that an important class of unhistorical elements consists of the traditions which build the popular images of historical figures (see II, 131-

133), on which point they are probably at variance with most others who have considered it.

20. P. 78 of this MS.

21. III, 716, 731-733; see vol. 3 for their treatment of several African societies.

22. III, 728-739, 748. Probably the Chadwicks do not mean to imply (nor should they) that every culture goes through these clearly defined stages of development. They do not deny diffusion and should not be seen as extreme unilinear cultural evolutionists. They do assume more independent development of similar traits by a number of cultures than some scholars would be willing to allow.

23. I, 16-18; II, 23-25, 465-466; III, 754-755.

24. III, 754-755.

25. Works which represent outgrowths of the Chadwicks' ideas include: C. M. Bowra, The Meaning of a Heroic Age (Newcastle upon Tyne, 1957); N. K. Sidhanta, The Heroic Age of India (London, 1929; inspired by Hector Chadwick's The Heroic Age); Richard M. Dorson, "Davy Crockett and the Heroic Age," Southern Folklore Quarterly 6 (1942): 95-102. The Chadwicks themselves felt that a study of British border balladry would prove fruitful (III, 681-693). Needless to say, they also provide an abundance of information on non-heroic forms of folklore. Richard M. Dorson's next book rests on the theoretical premise that certain types of historical periods and experiences foster the growth of unique types of folkloric manifestations (personal communication, August, 1971). M. B. Emeneau, "Oral Poets of South India -- the Todas," Journal of American Folklore 71 (1958): 322, is also relevant on the expansion of the Chadwicks' ideas.

26. III, 755-756.

27. III, 756.

28. The Hero: A Study in Tradition, Myth, and Drama was first published in London, 1936; references are to the Thinker's Library edition of 1949. Raglan's earliest statement in this area of thought was apparently his presidential address to the British Association, Section H (anthropological section) in 1933.

29. R. W. Chambers, England before the Norman Conquest (London, 1928), p. 69, had suggested that knowledge of the deeds of monarchs might be remembered without the aid of writing; M. E. Durham, Some Tribal Origins, Laws, and Customs of the Balkans (London, 1928), pp. 25-29, had suggested that certain groups of Albanians who had no traditions of descent from the ancient Dalmatians probably did not descent from them; Sir John Rhys, Celtic Folklore, Welsh and Manx, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1901), v.2, p.493, had felt that some legends might represent a human reaction to real events, such as the disappearance of a leader. These opinions are perhaps in need of criticism, but the point is that Raglan isolated and attacked what almost amount to off-the-cuff remarks; there was nothing off-hand about

the work of the Chadwicks.

Of course, intellectual disagreements often thrive on undercurrents which do not necessarily appear in print. It is not here implied that there was not more of an open controversy than there would appear to have been, nor that a knowledge of such a controversy might not come to light through the use of other sources.

30. M. P. Nilsson, Primitive Time-reckoning (Lund, 1920) is a basic study on this subject. See also David F. Pocock, "The Anthroplogy of Time-Reckoning," in Myth and Cosmos: Readings in Mythology and Symbolism, ed. John R. Middleton (New York, 1967), pp. 303-314; Paul Bohannan, "Concepts of Time among the Tiv of Nigeria," Southwestern Journal of Anthropology 9 (1953): 251-262; Warren L. d'Azevedo, "Uses of the Past in Gola Discourse," Journal of African History 3 (1962): 11-34.

31. The Hero, pp. 1-15.

32. Ibid., pp. 30-45.

33. The recognition of the existence of such institutions certainly predates Raglan. For example, Frederick York Powell, an eminent historian and Folk-Lore Society president, had stressed this in his Society presidential address of 1903 ("Tradition and Its Conditions," Folk-Lore 15 [1904]: 12-18).

34. The Hero, pp. 16-29.

35. "The Myth Ritual Theory," Journal of American Folklore 70 (1957): 103-114.

36. The Hero, p. 175.

37. Bascom, pp. 103-106.

38. Lord Raglan, "Reply to Bascom," Journal of American Folklore 70 (1957): 360; see also Raglan's earlier article, "Myth and Ritual," Journal of American Folklore 68 (1955): 454-461. Later Raglan attacked the findings of David Pendergast and Clement Meighan ("Folk Traditions as Historical Fact: A Paiute Example," Journal of American Folklore 72 [1959]: 128-133), insisting that the "historical" tradition they reported merely explained "facts" in retrospect; he also suggests that their informants did not really have traditions at all and made up something when questioned ("Folk Traditions as Historical Facts," Journal of American Folklore 73 [1960]: 58-59).

39. In Folklore 57 (1936): 404, W. R. Dawson had this to say about Raglan's work: "Unlike most scholars, Lord Raglan has had the advantage of entering upon his task with no prejudice and preconceived theory into which the facts must be fitted." That is utter nonsense.